RELIGION *necessary both to constitute the Nature, and to enforce the Practice of moral Virtue.*

---

A

# SERMON

PREACH'D

On SUNDAY, *October* 30. 1737.

BEING

## His Majesty's Birth-day,

AT THE

## *Cathedral Church* of St. *Paul.*

---

By *GEORGE WALKER*, M. A.
Prebendary of the said Church.

---

A State of Temperance, Sobriety and Justice, without Devotion, is a cold, lifeless, insipid Condition of Virtue; and is rather to be stil'd Philosophy than Religion.

ADDISON.

---

*LONDON:*
Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane.* MDCCXXXVIII.

Price Six-pence.

A

# SERMON

To the Right Reverend the

# Lord Biſhop of *Chicheſter*,

Dean of St. *PAUL*'s.

My Lord,

S this diſcourſe, when preach'd, was favour'd with your approbation, I have, in compliance with your Lordſhip's deſire, ventur'd to make it publick. I am very ſenſible your approbation of it proceeded, not ſo much from the manner in which the ſubject is treated, as from the ſubject itſelf, and as it expreſſes a ſincere

a ſincere and juſt concern for keeping Morality dependent on Religion, and a hearty zeal for ſuch principles, as are neceſſary for the ſupport of the Proteſtant Succeſſion, as it is at preſent ſettl'd in the Illuſtrious Houſe of *Hanover*, and, in that, of the Church of *England*.

If this diſcourſe will in any meaſure promote theſe good Ends; as your Lordſhip's views in deſiring its publication will be anſwer'd, ſo will thoſe of,

My LORD,

*Your* LORDSHIP'S

*Moſt Obedient,*

*Humble Servant,*

**Geo. Walker.**

St. MATTH. VII. 12.

*Whatſoever ye wou'd that men ſhou'd do to you, do ye even ſo to them; for this is the law and the prophets.*

AS conſiſtent as the divine laws may be among themſelves, as being deliver'd all by the wiſdom of the ſame infinite and unchangeable Being, yet in proportion to the ſtrength and influence of men's paſſions we frequently find them interpreted in contradiction to each other. The *offices of piety* in the worſhip of the Almighty ſhall, in the opinions of ſome, be reputed as unneceſſary, and *the duties of the ſecond table* ſhall be magnify'd the more, in order to juſtify their neglect of them. The precept I have now read to you ſhall be thought to comprehend the *Whole* of our duty, *all the duty* that is *needful*, becauſe the eſtabliſhment of it is the deſign both of the law and the prophets; as if nothing elſe were requir'd of us beſides the

exerciſe of juſtice and righteouſneſs in our dealings with one another.

In oppoſition therefore to thoſe, who are for reducing all religion to the *duties of the ſecond table*, and think to juſtify their *neglect* of the *offices of piety and the love of God* by a text thus perverted, I ſhall obſerve, (1*ſt*) That juſtice and equity are not the *whole* of what the law and the prophets inculcate under the notion of duty.

The law expreſsly enjoins the duties of the *firſt table*, relating to God; teaching us both an affectionate regard for, and alſo a ſincere and unreſerv'd obedience to him. *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy ſoul, and with all thy might*, Deut. vi. 5. See x. 12. The duties owing to him, ſuch as a *religious* regard and worſhip of him, are ſo far from being excepted, that they appear to be the the things *firſt* and *principally* requir'd.

And 'tis the deſign of the prophets, as well as of the law, not only to eſtabliſh the *duties of the ſecond table*, but alſo to maintain the *honour and dignity* of thoſe of *the firſt*. *A ſon honoureth his father, and a ſervant his maſter: If then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a maſter, where is my fear?* Mal. i. 6. And leſt it ſhou'd be thought that this is only to be underſtood of that honour and fear, which ariſe from an obedience to the divine Will in the *duties of the ſecond table*, it plainly appears from the context that it refers wholly to *thoſe of the firſt*.

Again,

Again, the words of *Micah* are full to our purpoſe: *What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do juſtly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God*, ch. vi. 8. See *Iſaiah* lv. 6. *Jonah* ii. 9.

And if any where we meet with diſparaging expreſſions about religious worſhip, they are directed not againſt the *duties of* it *themſelves*, but only againſt men's *manner* of *performing* them, as doing them either to a *wrong object*, or to a *right object in a wrong way*, and without a due regard to that juſtice or mercy we owe to our neighbour, or that reverence and attention we owe to God.

Thus far then we ſee that juſtice, righteouſneſs, and mercy are not the *whole* of what the law and the prophets inculcate under the notion of duty, but only what they inculcate with regard to the *duties of the ſecond table*, thoſe of the *firſt* being in point of dignity, as well as order, prior to them.

And the ſame thing is as obvious from the New Teſtament as it is from the Old. For to to the lawyer's queſtion, *Which is the great commandment in the law*, our Saviour anſwers, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy ſoul, and with all thy mind. This is the firſt and great commandment. And the ſecond is like unto it, Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thy ſelf: On theſe two commandments hang all the law and the prophets*, Matth. xxii. 37, 38, 39, 40. See *Mark* xii. 29, 30. *Luke* x. 27.

Here *piety in a religious intercourſe* with God in the duties of his worſhip has not only an equality with, but a preference to * *moral righteouſneſs*, in that the love of God is the *firſt* and *great* commandment; whereas the other is ſpoken of only in terms of *ſubordination* and *inferiority*. And in the *like ſubordination* are to be underſtood thoſe remarkable words of St. *James*, tho' they may have been thought to contain the ſum and ſubſtance of all religion whatſoever. *Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to viſit the fatherleſs and widows in their affliction, and to keep himſelf unſpotted from the world*, chap. i. 27.

What St. *Paul* ſays (*Rom.* xiii. 8, 9.) that *he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law; and that if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this ſaying, Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf*; is evidently ſpoken of the *duties of the ſecond table*, becauſe no other than *theſe* are treated of *here* as an effect of this principle, except the love of God be previouſly ſuppoſed, or included, becauſe 'tis the foundation of this love of our neighbour, as this again is the foundation of all the moral duties. And agreeable to this, the ſame St. *Paul*, when he gives us the heads of thoſe duties, which are the terms and conditions of our happineſs, mentions

* *N. B.* I have ſometimes ſuffer'd the word *moral*, in the popular ſenſe, to ſtand join'd with *righteouſneſs* and *duties*, to ſignify, in the common way, *the duties of the ſecond table*; tho', as I have endeavour'd to ſhew, there is nothing, ſtrictly ſpeaking, of a moral nature, but what is done out of a regard to the will of God, or for his ſake.

tions that duty we owe to God, as well as the reſt. *The grace of God that bringeth ſalvation, hath appeared to all men; teaching us, that denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, we ſhould live ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly in this preſent world,* Tit. ii. 11, 12.

Now if the Duties we owe either to our neighbour or ourſelves had been ſufficient, the apoſtle needed not have added *That*, which, by reaſon of the *object*, about which it is converſant, is commonly known by the name of *godlineſs*. 'Tis true indeed the apoſtle mentions both the other duties before it; but it can no more be argued to be of leſs importance on this account, than *righteouſneſs* can be judged to be of leſs importance than *ſobriety*, becauſe it is mentioned, contrary to that order, in which it is uſually reckoned, after that duty we owe to ourſelves. The apoſtle was not *ſcrupulous*, (nor indeed needed he to be *ſo*,) where he placed that duty of godlineſs, which, becauſe of its great reaſonableneſs, and the ſuperior dignity of its object, muſt ever be ſuppoſed ſufficient to maintain its *own authority*.

Nothing therefore can be more abſurd than for us to place the *whole* of our duty in the *exerciſe of juſtice and benevolence*, excluſive of the offices of piety, perform'd out of *the Love of God*.

But, however, we may obſerve farther, (2*dly*) That the *moral* value of the *duties of the ſecond table* depends altogether upon the *principles of obedience to thoſe of the firſt*.

To

*To love indeed our neighbour as ourſelves, and to do unto him as we would he ſhould do unto us*, is an excellent rule, and of admirable uſe in making us judge of the fitneſs of our actions from our own ſenſe and experience; but if this be done only out of ſelf-intereſt; if this rule, which conſults our neighbour's good, be obſerved only for the ſecurity of our own, this diminiſhes the merit and worth of ſuch behaviour, becauſe it is not *charity* to him, but *regard* to ourſelves. It is acting merely out of a mercenary principle like thoſe, *who lent only to receive as much again. Luke* vi. 34.

Neither is it true chriſtian charity, if it be obſerv'd only purely and ſimply out of that natural concern we can't help entertaining for the welfare of thoſe of our own ſpecies. For then it is only a ſort of *inſtinct* inclining us to acts of kindneſs without any *moral determination.*

The *virtue* therefore of acting by this Rule, muſt be fetched from ſome higher principle, as we are *conſcious* that *man bears the image of his maker*, and has many *diſtinguiſhing* marks of the divine goodneſs communicated to him: And here the *Love of God* comes in as the *foundation* of all that love and equity we owe to our neighbour. Leave out the conſideration of ſome ſuperior talents and endowments, in which we reſemble our creator, and love of our neighbour will have no more *merit*, than *That*, which *irrational* Creatures have for one another. However, it is not neceſſary that man ſhould always be *conſidered in this view*,

*view*, in order to ſecure the *virtue* of every act we perform to him, becauſe this may be ſecured by an *habitual ſenſe*, as the glory of God is conſulted in common caſes by a *general intention* of promoting it.

From hence it appears, though the love of ourſelves be the *meaſure* of that love we owe to our neighbour, yet however the love of God ought to be the *motive* of it, becauſe there can be nothing particularly worthy of eſteem and affection in the *creature*, but what proceeds from the fulneſs and perfection of the *Creator*. So that true chriſtian charity, which St. *Paul* calls, *the fulfilling of the law, and the end of the commandment*, and St. *James the royal law*, proceeds originally from, and is ultimately reſolvable into the love of God, which, for this reaſon therefore among others, is ſtiled the *firſt* and *great* Comandment.

As well, therefore, may a man pretend to the fulfilling of the law, by doing as we would be done by, without the love of our neighbour, as to the love of our neighbour, without the love of God, becauſe it manifeſtly appears that this is the ſpring and ſource of it.

And now ſince the love of God is the firſt and great commandment, we may obſerve (*1ſt*) from what has been ſaid, the groſs miſtake of ſuch, as take the precept of the text for the *whole* of their Duty, and conclude that this conſcientiouſly performed, ſuperſedes the neceſſity of all others. For the love of God expreſs'd in fervent acts of piety, devotion, and

faith

faith, is not leſs a *debt* to God, than juſtice and righteouſneſs are to our neighbour. It is true indeed, that ſome in the excurſions of flight and fancy have imagined, that as we can contribute nothing by our gratitude to the happineſs of our *Creator*, ſo all the duty that we can be oblig'd to, muſt be expreſs'd to the *creature*; that this is *imitating* the moral perfections of the almighty, *to be merciful as our father, who is in heaven, is merciful*; and laſtly, that this of doing good to our fellow-creatures is the only poſſible or practicable duty for poor weak mortals, ſince God is an object that is inviſible.

To the firſt of theſe it is eaſy to reply, that though the great Creator be not within the reach of our good offices, nor can be affected by the want of them; yet ſtill this is no warrantable excuſe for the neglect of religious duties, becauſe the exerciſe of them may be in many reſpects more ſerviceable to *ourſelves*, than the performance of the moral ones *are*, or *can* be to *one another*. For it may bring us to ſuch a ſenſe of the perfections of the *Divine Nature*, and of the frailties and weakneſſes of our *own*, as may beget in us *humility* for the *one*, and *reverence* for the *other*. And are the worſhip and ſervice of our Creator either *unfit* to be enjoin'd, or *improper* to be *practiſed*, when though they be not required for *his* ſake, they are yet ſo ſerviceable and neceſſary for our *own?*

Beſides, it may be obſerved, though the majeſty and perfections of God's Nature ſet him above the poſſibility of receiving any acceſſion to

his

his happineſs by the *beſt* of thoſe *religious ſervices* we are able to perform, that however we ought not to deny him the *tribute* of them, except we will *deny* the *fitneſs* of that *relation*, which is betwixt the *Creator* and the *creature*. And it would be abſurd to ſay, that acts of kindneſs and compaſſion to our fellow-creatures are expreſſive enough of this *relation*, becauſe they only expreſs that *relation* we ſtand in to one another. As therefore the *relations* between *God* and *us* are *diſtinct*, ſo the duties ariſing from theſe *relations* muſt needs be *ſo too*.

To the ſecond of theſe objections we anſwer, that doing good to all around us is a god-like act, giving us a kind of reſemblance to the Deity, who is good and merciful to all, ſupplying the wants of every other being. But then 'tis withal to be remember'd, that this is but *one perfection* of the Almighty, *one part of the* Divine Image and character. And accordingly we are commanded not only to be *merciful*, but to be *holy* and *perfect* as *our Father*, who *is in Heaven* is *ſo*.

As to what is urged in the laſt place, that this of doing good to our fellow-creatures is the only *poſſible* or *practicable* duty, ſince God himſelf is an *object* that is *inviſible*; we may obſerve, that this objection does not only lie againſt the love of God, as a thing *impoſſible*, or as too refined and ſpeculative a motive of human action, but even againſt that Being, who has commanded it, and made himſelf the object of *this affection*. And is it to be conceived that he would

have done *this*, if the *love of our neighbour* had been the only *poſſible* principle of our obedience?

'Tis readily allowed indeed that *this* is more obvious to vulgar minds, which are generally more affected with the objects of *ſenſe*, than with ſuch objects as are placed beyond the *reach* of it. And this I preſume is what St. *John* may be thought to mean, when he ſays, *He that loveth not his brother whom he hath ſeen, how can he love God whom he hath not ſeen?* But then the Apoſtle can't be underſtood to ſpeak of this as an *impracticable* duty, but only to prove, that he that doth not love his brother for reaſons that are more *obvious*, will hardly love God, when the reaſons are more *abſtracted*. Not but that the reaſons for the love of God are familiar enough to men of all capacities, who conſider, that tho' God be not ſo viſible in all his bleſſings as thoſe whom he appoints to convey them to us, yet nevertheleſs 'tis he who ſends them.

If it be ſaid by ſome, but what ſignify the reaſons for the love of God, ſo long as the object is himſelf *unknown*, I would only aſk ſuch perſons whether they were never in love with a perſon they never ſaw? I ſhall be told perhaps, that there is a vaſt deal of difference between the placing our affections upon one Being that is *viſible*, and upon another that is quite *otherwiſe*. But ſtill it is not the leſs true, that 'tis goodneſs, though *not ſeen*, when *exerciſed* in *our behalf*, that is the *object of our affections*. And if we can't help, as it were, loving goodneſs in ſome

degree

degree from any Being, whether *viſible or not*, when we *feel the effects of it ourſelves*, this is ſo far from proving the love of God *impoſſible*, as to *the act itſelf*, that it proves it almoſt neceſſary.

Whoſoever therefore, upon the whole of theſe obſervations, interprets the rule of the text, as if it contained the *whole* of our duty, excluſive of the *offices of piety*, and thinks that which is called *moral honeſty* is ſufficient of itſelf without them, is guilty of a grand miſtake, and ſuch an one too, as will render the performance of all his acts of benevolence and mercy, as to the *real nature* of *morality*, *inſignificant* and *vain*.

I obſerve therefore, (2*dly*) the *vanity* of all thoſe pretences to moral duties, which are done excluſive of the love of God. The acts of them, howſoever *beneficial* to our neighbour, are of no *moral* advantage, or ſervice to ourſelves. The exerciſe of theſe acts is only a little outward labour and trouble, which can deſerve no reward or recompenſe at the hand of God, becauſe 'tis no more than *natural goodneſs*, and has nothing in it of the *moral*. Let thoſe therefore, who are ſo apt to deride the *profeſſion of piety* and the *love of God*, conſider that all *true morality* is built upon *them*; that take away *theſe*, and all the acts of kindneſs and charity are of no *moral* account, nothing beyond the capacity of an *heathen*, except they be *diſtinguiſhed* by that *principle*, from which they flow. For where this does not make the *difference*, what are all our *dealings*, ſetting aſide the direction of natu-

ral inſtinct, but *deſign*, our *kindneſs* but *cunning*, and all that *love* we pretend for our neighbour, but only a more *artful reſpect* ſhewn to ourſelves?

I obſerve therefore, *laſtly*, the *excellency of that inſtitution*, which, in fixing *virtue* upon *proper* principles, has taught us to love God *firſt*, and *then* our neighbour on *God's account*.

'Tis confeſſed indeed the rule of the text has been always very deſervedly admired, and the uſe of it very juſtly extolled, by reaſon of thoſe happy effects, which both *have*, and *would have been* the *conſequence* of acting in obedience to its directions. But howſoever well calculated it might be to ſerve either our own, or others *natural* intereſts, yet the *moral* benefit of obſerving it depends upon its *conformity to the principles of the Chriſtian Religion*. For by theſe the rule receives a very conſiderable improvement. That which is our *intereſt* is made our *virtue* alſo, and the conſulting of our *nature*, in ſome of the moſt tender *movements* of it, is performing an act of *true Religion*. The *love* of God, which the *Chriſtian Religion* in *particular* has taught us as the foundation of acting by *this rule*, ſanctifies and elevates every action done by the direction of it, and transforms all our *natural* works into works of *moral* goodneſs.

Let us therefore embrace, and ever hold faſt that religion, which points out to us ſuch noble principles of action, which lays ſuch a *foundation* as gives a greater *value* to the *ſuperſtructure*, and teaches us how to turn every *act of ſelf-love* and *convenience into an act of virtue*.

Since

Since then our religion has taught us, that the *nature* of *moral* duty, in *obedience* to *this rule*, depends upon the *love of God*, it will be worth while to enquire a little here, when it is that we act upon *this principle*, and what *ſort* of actions are neceſſary to evince the *truth* of it. And here, no doubt, it will be argued, that acts of kindneſs to our fellow-creatures are *ſufficient* proof of it without the *neceſſity* of any other, that what is *done* for *our neighbour's* ſake is *done for God's*, and that our Saviour himſelf ſeems to countenance this reaſouing in a like caſe, when he looks upon acts of charity ſhewn to his *diſtreſſed members*, as *perſonal* kindneſs ſhewn to *himſelf*: *In as much as ye have done it unto one of the leaſt of theſe my brethren, ye have done it unto Me.* Mat. xxv. 40. But here it ought to be obſerv'd, that our bleſſed Lord looks upon theſe acts as *perſonal* kindneſſes, becauſe they were exerciſed towards his *diſtreſſed members*, as *ſuch*, as ſtanding in that *particular relation* to him. 'Tis plain therefore, that acts of kindneſs are no ſuch argument of *the love of God*, as theſe are of the *love of Chriſt*, unleſs they are ſhewn, in general, with the like regard to our *fellow-creatures*, as *God's image*, that theſe are done to our *fellow-chriſtians*, as *members of Chriſt's body*. But now no one can be thought to exerciſe them towards his *neighbour*, as *God's image*, whilſt he expreſſes all his regards for the *copy*, but none *at all* for the *original*.

And this reaſoning wou'd be much the ſame in the other inſtance. For were a man only to cheriſh

cherish the *afflicted members of Christ*, but were to refuse all *other acts due to Christ*, as *his Saviour*, no one could believe that he had either any *true* regard for him, or his *distressed members* upon account of their *relation to him*, because *sincere* affection wou'd not be wanting in *any* expression *proper* to be given of it. Even so neither can we believe, that that man has any *real* affection for the Almighty, from his *works* of *charity* to his neighbour, when at the same time he is scandalously negligent of the *works* of *piety*; because we have reason enough to deny the *truth* of that affection, when, at all *proper* opportunities, the *principal* expression of it is found wanting.

'Ts true indeed, St. *John* says, that *This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.* But then I think, it may be observ'd still without prejudice to the apostle, who fetches his proof of the love of God from keeping of the commandments, that it ought first to be prov'd in keeping *such* of them, as are the most *natural* expressions of it. If therefore it does not express itself in a religious intercourse with God in the duties of his worship, which are the more *immediate signs* of it, we have reason to deny its *influence* in acts that are *less proper* to it.

Let men therefore pretend never so much to the *excellency* and *sufficiency* of the moral duties, it appears they can never justify their pretences of the *love* of their neighbour, till they perform *such acts* of *piety* and *religion* as argue the *truth* of their love of God.

But, after all, perhaps it may be ſtill inſiſted on, that acts of kindneſs and compaſſion to our fellow-creatures are the moſt *certain* and *infallible* expreſſion of the *ſincerity* of our love of God, and *the only one*, that is required, becauſe the apoſtle ſeems to determine our love of God *purely* by this expreſſion of it. *If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us*, 1 John iv. 12. See *ver.* 16. In anſwer to this we muſt obſerve, that in order to judge of our *ſincerity*, with regard to our acting upon any *principle*, we muſt perform all ſuch acts, as *that principle obviouſly* requires of us.

Now the *love of* God requires acts of *homage, reverence*, and *adoration in the worſhip of* him, as well as *tenderneſs* and *benevolence* to men like ourſelves. And the former kind of theſe acts does as properly at leaſt belong to it, and are equally *certain* expreſſions of it (without ſuppoſing all to be pure ecſtaſy) as the latter. It does not therefore follow, becauſe a man can't do the ſame good offices to God, who is *inviſible*, whom *no man hath ſeen at any time* (as the apoſtle ſays, in the former part of the *verſe*) as he can do to his fellow-creatures, that theſe are *the whole* of his obedience, or the *only neceſſary proof* of his *ſincerity* to the Almighty. For indeed, with reſpect to *This*, if a man were *ſincere*, not actuated by any thing but principle, no *evidence* of his affection would be wanting. His love would expreſs itſelf in an *uniform* and *entire* obedience to *all* God's Commandments, but eſpecially to *Thoſe*, which more *immediately*

*mediately* concern the *honour* of that Being, we profeſs to love.

Now the honour of God is more *immediately* concerned in *religious duties*, whether publick or private, than in the *moral*, as he's the more *immediate* object of them, and alſo as both ourſelves and our fellow-creatures are abſolutely dependent upon him for their very *power* and *capacity* of doing good to each other. And as God has not only a *right* to *ſingle* or *private* worſhip, in vertue of thoſe *private bleſſings* conferr'd upon *particular perſons* in a *particular way*, but alſo a *right* to * *publick* or *ſocial worſhip*, in vertue of thoſe *publick mercies*, which man can't enjoy but in his *ſocial* capacity; ſo, though God is well pleaſed and glorified by the moral exerciſe of thoſe good diſpoſitions, which tend to procure the comfort and happineſs of each other, yet we can't give him *that glory*, which

* There is an excellent argument for publick worſhip in the late Dean *Sherlock*'s book of religious aſſemblies, the ſubſtance of which, for its uſefulneſs, I ſhall inſert here in a note by itſelf. "Tho' "we are bound (ſays he) to acknowledge thoſe particular favours "and bleſſings, which God hath beſtowed upon us, which is the "foundation of private worſhip; yet God is not ſo much to be "conſidered a private, as a publick benefactor, as an univeeſal "parent, and ſovereign Lord, and therefore muſt be worſhipped "as a publick benefactor, *i. e.* with publick worſhip; eſpecially "when it is conſidered that the greateſt bleſſings we are to praiſe "God for, are ſuch as are beſtowed on us in common with others, "or all mankind; ſuch as the influences of Heaven, and the fruitfulneſs of the earth; the bleſſings of peace and plenty; deliverance from enemies; the advantages of good government, and "all other national mercies: and, above all, the redemption of "the world by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; ſo that God is defrauded "of his glory, if our acknowledgments be not as publick, as his "bleſſings are. For private praiſes are not juſt returns for publick "mercies." Pag. 119, 120, 121.

which is *more immediately* due to him, whilſt we refuſe to acknowledge him under the notion either of our *private* or *publick benefactor*. The denial of it therefore muſt be utterly inconſiſtent with the ſincerity of our affections. But to return; we don't ſay, that religion towards God is always a *true ſign* of our affection to our neighbour, any more than acts of kindneſs to our neighbour are always a *true ſign* of our love of God. But however this we affirm, that our love of God willing to expreſs itſelf by an obedience to the commandments of the *firſt table*, ought to be the *principle* of our obedience in thoſe of the *ſecond*; that therefore it is not enough that we are only good *moral* men in the language of the world, becauſe all *moral* works, that are *really ſuch*, derive their *nature* from *religious* principles, and that as morality in the duties of the ſecond table is eſſential to true religion, ſo religion is eſſential to true morality.

Having thus far ſhewn, that the true and real nature of moral virtue depends upon the *love of God*, I ſhall proceed now (2*dly*) to conſider, that the practice of it depends upon the *ſame motive*, or ſome ſuch other inward principle of religion.

But here I would obſerve firſt, That a pure naked *philoſophical* eſteem of the Deity, ariſing from a view of his excellencies and perfections, is a principle far too weak to enforce the *conſtant* and *invariable* exerciſe of our benevolence to our fellow-creatures, when at the ſame time we

are forbid to look for any other advantage from it ourſelves. 'Tis true, there may be a pleaſure in the bare contemplation of the divine perfections; but then either a great part of that pleaſure would ceaſe, if it were not for the general hopes we entertain (though not ſo particularly regarded) of a *future recompence* at the hands of that Being we delight in; or however, there could be no *effectual obligation* to induce us to put our *neighbour's good* upon the *ſame level with That*, which is *more natural, our own*. And as this would not only be unreaſonable, but impoſſible alſo according to the preſent conſtitution of human nature, ſeparating the conſiderations of a future ſtate; ſo the *motive* to part with any thing at preſent muſt be, not the *abſtract*, but the *relative* goodneſs of the Deity, who will render this a reaſonable practice by *making us amends in reverſion*. Whatever may be ſaid of the *fitneſs of acting by this rule, of doing as we would be done by*, or *whatever* may be pleaded for its obſervance from our *rational* natures; yet it is certain, that, as we are *conſtituted*, we can be determined to act by nothing, but what ſome way or other, upon the whole, contributes to our happineſs.

Setting aſide therefore the hopes of reaping the *natural advantages* of this equitable behaviour, as in many caſes we have no proſpect at all of a return of it; and likewiſe, ſuppoſing the Deity at the ſame time to have no manner of regard to us for the loſs of them, all *ſocial* regards muſt immediately fail, except we could

be determined to act, where we have no *proper motives* of action.

'Tis the *relative* goodneſs of God therefore, and not the *natural equity* or *fitneſs* of the *ſocial* and *moral* duties alone, that can be an *adequate engagement* to the practice of them.

But to proceed, ſome ſtill may be apt to imagine, that the practice of the moral duties does not depend upon the love of God, becauſe, that when the perſon in the * Goſpel came to enquire, which of the commandments he ſhou'd keep, in order to his entrance into life, it is pretty remarkable that our Saviour only anſwers in the duties of the *ſecond table*. But then it is to be conſidered, that one reaſon, which made it needleſs here for our Saviour to inſiſt particularly on the love of God was this, becauſe he knew that the moral duties cou'd not well be obſerv'd, or, if obſerv'd, would be imperfect and defective without it. For though a *natural* good diſpoſition may carry a man pretty far, in the obſervance of many of the moral duties, where his virtue is *not put to the teſt*, yet it is of very little *ſubſtantial* ſervice or advantage to him, where *it is*. And accordingly our Saviour ſoon made it appear, how neceſſary the love of God was in the Diſcharge even of ſome of the moral duties themſelves, when the young man's refuſal of his obedience, in the particular inſtance, intended for the trial of him, proceeded plainly from the want of it. 'Tis an eaſy matter to obey in things that no way oppoſe any

 *particu-*

* See *Mat.* xix. 16, 17 &c.

*particular inclination*; but however it is beyond all doubt, that nothing can *ſecure obedience*, but *principle*, in caſes, that are *directly againſt it*.

But leaſt it ſhould be ſaid, that this young man's benevolence might have ſhewn itſelf on this occaſion, had any thing leſs been demanded than the whole of what he had, and that this could not fairly be inſiſted on, in oppoſition to a principle of ſelf-preſervation; without taking notice that he had no reaſon to fear, but that he would ſupply him with the neceſſaries of *this life*, who had engaged for his happineſs in a *future*, I ſhall obſerve, that without the love of God we ſhall find very little of the *ſteady* kind of benevolence even in ſome of the leſſer or more common degrees of it. 'Tis true indeed there is a *natural inclination* or *propenſion* to acts of benevolence, when we happen to meet with objects of diſtreſs before our eyes: However it muſt be obſerv'd, that this is not like *that inſtinct* we find in Brutes, which can never be abuſed: We ſometimes ſuffer other inclinations to grow up to ſuch a degree, as either wholly to divert, or check it in its exerciſe; or though it may ſhew forth itſelf in ſome *glaring* acts of relief upon a *particular occaſion*, or during *the continuance* of *ſome particular temper*, yet it can never be *conſtant* and *perpetual*, except it becomes *an habit*, and is governed by that *ruling principle of the love of God*. For where *This* is not the *prevailing motive*, men's *benevolence*, as many fine things may be ſaid in

the behalf of it, will only *operate by fits and ſtarts*, juſt as their own *reputation*, *humour*, or the *examples* of others ſhall *occaſionally* lead them.

They, therefore, who inſiſt ſo much on the *active ſpirit of benevolence*, as *ſufficient of itſelf alone* for all thoſe ſervices we owe to our brethren, ſeem to have conſulted more the *pride* of *philoſophy* than the *true meaſures of human nature*, and have either unwarily, or unwiſely dropt thoſe *chriſtian motives*, which both our Saviour and his apoſtles have added, as well knowing the *weakneſs* of the *natural operation* of our *kindeſt inſtincts* and moſt *benevolent affections*.

And it muſt not be omitted here, that the ſcriptures have ſuch a particular regard to our acting upon this principle of the love or fear of God, that they fail not to inculcate thoſe *relative duties* we owe to each other upon the *foot of it*, or a *due regard to the Deity*. They don't leave the *practice of 'em* to the bare conſiderations of their *fitneſs* ariſing from theſe *relations*, but *command us* (out of a knowledge of the uncertainty of our obedience to ſuch fitneſs) if we are *ſubjects*, to *obey the magiſtrates, not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake*, becauſe *they are the ordinance of God*; if *children, to obey our parents in the Lord*; if *maſters, to be merciful to ſervants, as knowing that we alſo have a maſter in heaven*; *if ſervants, to obey our maſters according to the fleſh*; *not with eye ſervice, as men pleaſers, but in ſingleneſs of heart, as fearing God, and doing it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men*;

and

and ſo in every other relation of life. *Col.* iii. *Eph.* vi. *Rom.* xiii.*

And if God Almighty has thought fit in his wiſdom to *ſtrengthen the practice* of theſe duties ariſing from *theſe relations* by the *addition of ſuch a ſanction*, then we ſee at once how ridiculous all thoſe reaſonings muſt be, which refer us to the *fitneſs* of theſe *relations*, as an *inducement equally ſufficient* for the *practice of* them *without it*.

What I would obſerve now from hence is, *firſt*, how weak all the *motives* are, and how tottering all the *foundations* of duty beſides *thoſe of the Chriſtian Religion*. When once we begin to deſert the principles of *this*, we ſee in what intricate mazes and uncertainties we are loſt, that we have no ſafe ground to ſtand on any longer than we perſue the paths and directions of our *Maſter*; that therefore we ought, in our treating on this *rule of equity*, to fix it, not upon ſuch principles as leave the obſervance of it at beſt but precarious and uncertain, but that we have a ſpecial regard to *ſuch*, as will bear the *ſtreſs* that is laid upon them, and are *ſufficient*, not only *to conſtitute the nature*, but likewiſe *effectually to enforce the practice of moral virtue*.

*Another* obſervation alſo ariſing from hence is this, that men's practice will be in proportion to the *nature* of their principles.

* Second Paſtoral Letter, p. 68, 69.

But

But let us obſerve a little more particularly what men's practice would be, if it were entirely ſtript of all the *aids* of religion. Now if that temper of benevolence ſo much inſiſted on depends on the *praiſe of men*, it will only ſhew itſelf in ſome *publick acts*, it will never be *exerciſed as a private virtue*. If it be conſidered only as a mere *mechanical affection*, then 'tis nothing but what *ſickneſs* or little *accidents in life* may *alter*.

But further, *This affection*, even where it is *naturally the ſtrongeſt*, depends very much upon the belief and opinion we have of the *dignity* and *excellence* of *our own nature*. Suppoſing therefore our nature to be only like that of the *beaſts that periſh*, how muſt this impair and weaken the natural *ſtrength of this diſpoſition* towards each other, when we look upon *ourſelves as Beings* of no *longer continuance than they*? And though we may have many *inſtincts* like the brute-creation giving us a tender concern for the welfare of each other, yet the force of a *ſuperior faculty* carrying us to ſeveral melancholy reflections, which they are unable to make, would prevent their *operating in the ſame manner*. Whereas, on the other hand, the *conſideration* that we are all made in the *image of God*, and deſigned for a *future and eternal ſociety*; muſt needs raiſe in us a much higher *eſteem*, and conſequently a more *tender regard* than we could have for *each other*, conſidered only as mere *momentary beings*, who muſt ſink into nothing, when once this *ſcene is cloſed*.

And

And as little would *conſcience*, *natural pride*, as it is ſometimes called, or an *improved ſenſe and underſtanding*, avail towards ſecuring a *right behaviour*, and conducting us *honeſtly* through life, if we abſtract from all *religious principles whatſoever*. The *firſt* of theſe cannot *effectually oblige* without a *ſuperior Being* to be *accountable* to: the *ſecond* will be of little uſe, where-ever the ground of actions truly reputable happens to be miſtaken: and the *third*, without ſome more *ſubſtantial reſtraint or controul* than that of *mere fitneſs*, is only a more extenſive *capacity* of doing miſchief.

Compute now the good that is done in the world, and the greateſt part of it will be found to be evidently owing to the *influences of true religion*.

Some however there are, who are never to be perſuaded but that men may be *good* of themſelves, and behave well enough if they pleaſe, without the *help* of any *religion at all*. But this only ſhews, that there is ſuch a thing as an *irreligious enthuſiaſm*, and that ſome thro' a warm imagination can fondly flatter themſelves into *any conceits* (how ridiculous ſoever) of what they have a mind to believe.

'Tis poſſible indeed, not only that a man *void of all religion* may *forbear* an *evil action*, but that he may *perform materially a good one*, whilſt he acts only from *proſpects and views of intereſt*; but then he will act a part juſt the reverſe of all this, whenever his *intereſt* ſhall lead him to ſuch a *ſort* of behaviour.

Thus

Thus we have obſerved, particularly, that our *practice* will bear a proportion to the nature of our principles, though *This* had appeared pretty plain before by that *additional ſtrength* made to the *one*, the better to *enforce and engage the other*.

But then it will be aſked perhaps, Where does the *ſuperior influence* of theſe *better principles* appear? to which we anſwer, that as religion operates in a *moral way*, not by *force*, but by *reaſon and argument*, ſo the *greatneſs of* its *influence* muſt be *judged of*, not where it is *reſiſted*, but where it is *complied with*. Let men therefore but act *ſincerely* according to their *principles*, and we ſhall find upon experience that their *practice* will be in *proportion to the ſtrength of them*. And as there is no reaſon to deny, but that *ſound principles* may engage men to *act*, *as ſincerely* as thoſe that are *imperfect or defective*; ſo it is certain they will be as *different* in their *effects*, as they are in their *foundation*. *Theſe* will bear a *proportion*, not to their *ſincerity* or *perſuaſion only*, but to the *principles themſelves*, from which they proceed. After theſe obſervations, I ſhall now go on ſtill in a more general way to conſider, that there is very little morality to be expected, even among ſuch as *do* pretend to *the love of God*, where it is not *cheriſhed* by *the frequent and ſincere performance of religious duties*. For is it natural to believe that they can ever retain any great love for God, who *never contemplate his divine perfections?* or that they can ever *preſerve* any conſiderable *reverence*

for his *Juſtice* or *Majeſty*, who *never endeavoured to be acquainted with his Nature.*

But then it may be replied, Cannot the knowledge of God be *obtained*, and the love of him be as *effectually cheriſhed* by the bare *abſtract-ſpeculations* on his *Nature* and *Providence*, as by the *uſe of any religious exerciſes whatſoever?*

In anſwer to this, tho' 'tis neceſſary that we ſhould know God before we worſhip him, I need only take notice of what has been obſerv'd by a great * writer of the *Jewiſh* people, *viz.* That they ſunk into a deplorable ignorance and forgetfulneſs of God and of his laws, under the want of thoſe religious helps proper to prevent it. And yet 'tis certain they were *ſurrounded with all the glories of this natural ſyſtem* to *keep up a due ſenſe of their* beneficent Author freſh upon their minds. But how little did all theſe contribute to *preſerve the remembrance of his goodneſs*, when they *neglected* all *private opportunities*, and were in a great meaſure *deſtitute of the publick ones of worſhipping and ſerving him?*

If this then be the *natural conſequence* of leaving God's *goodneſs unregarded in the worſhip of him*, we ask upon this head, Will a man be *conſcientiouſly honeſt*, when he has loſt in a great meaſure that *ſenſe of duty*, which ſhou'd *engage* him to be *ſo*? 'Tis probable indeed that he may be *outwardly ſo*, whilſt the *force* of *human laws* can neither be *defy'd*, nor *evaded.* But when he thinks they *may*, how little ſhall we ſee of thoſe tender regards we owe to one another? Nay, what

* *See* Prid. Connect. 8vo. Vol. II. p. 559, *&c.*

what *mercy* ſhall we meet with either in *our perſons*, or *our property*? We ſhall neither be *ſecure* in the *one*, nor *ſafe* in the *other*.

When this, however, cannot be deny'd, 'tis frequently pretended that men may be *educated* to ſuch a *ſenſe of decency*, as to have a ſtrict regard to all the *moral duties* purely upon the *ſtrength of it*. How much *this* were to be *wiſh'd* for we need not *ſay*; thus much however is *certain*, whatever may be affirmed to the contrary, that *no ſenſe of decency*, how *ſtrongly ſoever inculcated*, can bear up againſt the *preſſing force of a temptation*, except 'tis founded on a *ſenſe of religion*. This is the *only principle*, which, *as it ſets God always before us*, can *make us juſt and upright on all occaſions whatſoever*. There is no *other*, but what *will give way*, when any thing in *particular occurs to try the ſtrength of it*.

'Tis plain then, upon the whole, that the *practice of the moral duties* depends chiefly upon a *due ſenſe of religious ones*. 'Tis not deny'd however, but that the uſe of *theſe may be defeated*, with reſpect to that *influence* they ought to have upon the *other*. But this not only *may*, but neceſſarily *muſt* be the caſe, where a *ſenſe of that Being*, neceſſary to *enforce* them, is *loſt* through a *diſuſe of that worſhip*, enjoin'd to *preſerve* it. If therefore they ſhould not happen to depart from the rules of moral honeſty in their practice, we may, I think, aſcribe it to a *rare felicity of conſtitution*, to the *abſence of temptation*, to the *fear of a diſcovery*, or to the *ſtill prevailing conſideration of ſome occaſional convenience*. But aba-

ting ſuch like caſes as theſe, they live in a conſtant readineſs, for any religious reſtraints to the contrary, to act all that deceit and treachery, which their own inclinations ſhall prompt them to.

And from hence it appears, that religion in its *conſtant* exerciſe, *publick* and *private*, is the beſt *friend to morality*, and that nothing elſe can ſo effectually *ſecure the ends*, and *ſupport the intereſts of it*.

And as the *exerciſe of religion in the worſhip of him*, who is the great *object of worſhip*, is of ſingular advantage in *promoting* and *ſecuring* the *obſervance of moral duties*; it follows of courſe, that it muſt be in the *ſame degree friendly to the intereſts of human ſociety*, becauſe the *good order*, *peace*, and *happineſs of it* conſiſts in a *ſincere* and *regular diſcharge of them*.

If this be granted us, then I hope we may ſay, without ſuſpicion of any *invidious reflection* on the one hand, or of any *partiality* on the other, that *They* are the greateſt *enemies*, or *friends*, to the *intereſts of civil government*, who diſcover an *indifference*, or a *zeal*, and who in conſequence hereof, *diſcourage*, or *perſuade*, to the *practice of religious duties*.

As to *Ourſelves*, under a *particular denomination*, we are not pleading for any *particular marks* of favour for inculcating 'em at the hands of *Thoſe*, who *rule over us*. What we only aim at, is to *prevent the influence* of any *malicious ſuggeſtion*, that, whilſt we are *perſuading others* to *fear God*, we *ourſelves* may not unjuſtly be reputed

as

as *unſerviceable* to the *King*, or *uſeleſs* to *that Society*, whoſe intereſts we *ſerve*, in a *degree*, not perhaps leſs *obvious* than others, tho' much *leſs heeded* than undoubtedly it deſerves.

As the people of this nation have for ſome years been falling off from that *great fundamental duty of divine worſhip*, thro' a falſe perſuaſion, that nothing more is requir'd than what we owe to one another, a diſcourſe of this kind can't be thought improper or unſeaſonable to recall them back to the performance of *that duty*, ſo *greatly grown into diſuſe*; and to ſhew them, that *religion is neceſſary both to conſtitute the nature*, and to *enforce the practice of moral virtue*.

Some perhaps there may be, who are either ſo *perverſe*, or ſo *trifling*, as to imagine we are only *advancing paradoxes*, and *ſerving our own ends*, when we fix them as dependent one upon another. But I hope it has appeared, that the principle we have laid down of having a regard to the Deity, is the only *ſure foundation* of *morality*; and that what we have advanc'd is a ſcheme, which is the beſt calculated of all others to promote the *practice of moral duties*, and to *ſerve the intereſts of civil government*.

As to any other principle, it muſt be allow'd *at beſt to be uncertain*. *Pride* may be *diſguſted*, and *intereſt* may *fail*, and the *ſtrongeſt of human laws* may be *diſregarded* through the *hopes of impunity*. And if nothing can *ſo effectually provide* for the *ſafety of the Prince*, the *welfare of our country*, *and what we owe to one another*, *as a principle of religion*; then we hope that the *Chriſtian*

*ſtian*, which furniſhes us with the beſt motives and principles of action, will be held in the *ſame eſteem*, as our *temporal intereſts*, and *never want* either the *protection of* the *civil magiſtrate*, or the *encouragement* of *that good and gracious Family*, whoſe intereſt is beſt conſulted in its ſupport and preſervation.

But to ſay no more of this, the *Annual* return of *this* Day*, which *gave birth* to the *Prince*, *now upon the throne*, naturally reminds us of ſome *particular moral duties*, *of gratitude to God*, for the gracious *continuance of his Majeſty's life*, and of *loyalty*, *ſubmiſſion*, and *obedience*, that we may add (ſo far as it depends upon us) both to the *length* and the *peace* of it. And none I am ſure will be wanting in this, who conſider it *as a bleſſing*, in which *all* of us have *one common intereſt*, as being a *glorious pledge* and *ſecurity of* all thoſe *other bleſſings*, derived to us from the *happy Revolution:* A *Revolution never to be forgotten* by any but *Thoſe*, who *want* either *temper to conſider*, or *honeſty* to *own* the bleſſings they enjoy. Thoſe, who think they *may be enjoyed* in ſome *other way*, than in *That*, in which they have them, want to be convinced by *ſuch experiments*, as, from the *ſad effects* we have *already felt*, we hope *never to ſee repeated*, and to be told, that the rules of *moral virtue* require our regards to be paid, *not to him*, who *would diſturb*, *but to him*, who *protects us in the enjoyment of our Civil* and *Religious Liberties*, i. e. in *All*, which *can diſtinguiſh* us either as a *free people*, or as a *people*, *truly chriſtian*.

May

* Preach'd on his Majeſty's Birth-day.

May ſuch therefore be aſhamed of their pretences to moral virtue, who inſtead of *ſtudying to be quiet*, are always *encouraging ſuſpicions* in the minds of the people, and who, after all their *oaths and obligations*, can be guilty of the *vileſt prevarication* and *hypocriſy*, in *ſpeaking evil of thoſe dignities*, to whom by name and in the moſt ſolemn manner they have profeſſed to be true. If *This be moral virtue* (or indeed any part of it) there are no *miſchiefs* ſo *great*, no *diſrepect or inſolence* to *Governors* ſo *inſufferable*, but what may be *patronized* under the *name of it*.

Let us therefore poſſeſs ourſelves with the *deepeſt abhorrence of ſuch behaviour*, by conſidering it as inconſiſtent both with *morality* and *religion*; that the *virtues* of *honour*, *love*, *peace* and *quietneſs* are as much the duty of every *good member of ſociety*, as of every *private chriſtian*; that therefore he, who is never *ſatisfy'd*, who, thro' a wanton deſire of change, either *raiſes jealouſies where they are not*, or *foments them where they are*, is indeed entitl'd to *neither of theſe characters*; it being too ſtrong a *preſumption* againſt any man's *religion likewiſe*, that he does not *fear God*, when he won't *honour the King*.

Thus much I was willing to ſay, being call'd upon by the nature of my ſubject, that we may know how to be content and thankful for that *great* and *publick bleſſing*, which the *return of this Day annually* renews.

(2*dly*) Since *religion is neceſſary both to conſtitute the nature*, and to *enforce the practice of moral virtue*, let us all in our ſeveral ſtations endeavour

deavour by proper means to cultivate an *inward ſenſe of it.* For *this*, where it is, is the *ſureſt proviſion* that can be made for the *good of ſociety*, as making us the beſt *moral men*, and the beſt *ſubjects*, by engaging us ſtill to a *conſcientious regard* to our duty, when no *mortal eye ſeeth us.*

But however, tho' the obſervance of the moral duties for the good of ſociety could be provided for *without religion*, yet ſtill *prudence* ſhou'd adviſe us to perform them upon a *principle of it*, leſt, whilſt others reap the benefit of the *outward exerciſe* of them, we *ourſelves* at laſt *ſhou'd loſe our reward.*

I ſhou'd now conclude, but that I would juſt beg leave to take notice, that, ſince the *good of ſociety* is ſo greatly *intereſted in the exerciſe of religious duties*, we ought in particular to REVERENCE THE SABBATH-DAY, *appointed* for the *obſervance of them.* 'Tis allow'd indeed, that *other ſeaſons* are equally neceſſary to *create a ſenſe*, and to *fix an habit of religion* in the minds of men. But if they were left to their own liberty, without any *certain time ſettled* for *thinking upon* God, what wou'd be the conſequence, but that *all religion* wou'd be *univerſally neglected*, and *That*, which is *the buſineſs of all times*, become in the end the *buſineſs of none?*

But then ſome will think themſelves entitl'd to ask, What Aſſiſtance in Life is *That*, which can be expected from the religious obſervance of *ſo ſmall a portion* of our time? To which the anſwer is obvious, That a regard *duly* had to the exerciſes of religion on the *Sabbath-day*, is the

way

way to cheriſh a *proportionable* regard to them on *all the reſt*. And they who ſlight and make no account of the impreſſions made by *that day*, together with the *frequent returns* of it to renew them, may probably be the *firſt* that may *feel* the *want* of them, either in the *treachery* of their *ſervants*, or in the *extravagance* and *diſobedience of their children*. If they do not, they have ſuch *natural good diſpoſitions* to deal with, as are *not ordinarily* to be met with, and therefore not *ordinarily to be rely'd on*.

For any thing therefore that appears from hence to the contrary, the *religious obſervance of the Sabbath-day* may be highly neceſſary for the more *general* part of mankind, who, in all probability, could neither be *made*, nor *kept* tolerably *good without it*.

And perhaps, after all, it may not be unneceſſary for others, notwithſtanding they may affect to be thought above the *want* of any *religious helps and Inſtructions*. For tho' they may know as much as we can tell them, what avails *all this*, ſince 'tis nothing at all to the purpoſes of *conduct in life*, *how much they know*, except they *remember* it.

*Little* do they *conſider*, and *leſs* do they *know* of the infirmities of human nature, who are not ſenſible that many who are apt to think the beſt of themſelves, wou'd have their notions of God and religion *very much impair'd*, or *entirely extinguiſh'd*, if it were not for the *frequent returns of this day* to *preſerve the impreſſions of them*. And it may be, that *Thoſe*, who have any religion at

*other times*, may notwithſtanding, as little as they perceive it, owe it to the *appointment* of *this*; and that even *ſuch*, as ſeem by a certain *heedleſs levity* to be got beyond all *thought and regard of Him*, that *made them*, may yet be *reclaim'd* and *brought back* to a *remembrance of their Creator*, whilſt *this day* is allow'd to be a *ſtanding memorial*, to *put them in mind* of that piety, duty and obedience they owe him: whereas if it were *taken wholly away*, or, which is the ſame thing, *entirely neglected*; then, as all hopes of *theſe happy ends* wou'd be *defeated*, ſo we ſhou'd find the *natural conſequence* wou'd be, that the *want of morality* wou'd be *in proportion* to the *want of religion*.

Let us therefore be ſure to *reverence the ſabbath-day*; ſo that by *obſerving piety towards God*, we may have a *truer ſenſe of* what we owe both to *Him*, and *one another*.

7 JU66

*F I N I S.*

---

ERRATA.

Pag. 9. l. 17. for *being* r. *Being*.
Pag. 11. l. 9. for *which* r. *what*.